Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Local Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and 44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

- N Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.
- S Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the prerequisite box for single jurisdiction plans.

States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Example

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

	Location in the Plan (section or		SCO	ORE
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	IN	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		✓
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10- 20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. Required Revisions: Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. Recommended Revisions: This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	✓	
		SUMMARY SCORE	✓	

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Jurisdiction:	Title of Plan:		Date of Plan:	
Park County	Hazard Mitigation Plan		August 2005	
Local Point of Contact:		Address:		
Belinda Van Nurden		City/County Complex		
Title:		414 East Callender Stre	eet	
Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator		Livingston, MT 59047		
Agency:				
Park County				
Phone Number:		E-Mail:		
406-222-4190		des@parkcounty.org		

State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Kent Atwood	Acting SHMO	October 22, 2005
_		
FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Donna Boreck	Mitigation Specialist	December 6, 2005
Wade Nofziger	Mitigation Specialist	December 12, 2005
Doug Bausch	Program Specialist	February 1, 2006
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	November 30, 2005	
Plan Not Approved		

		NFIP Status*		
Jurisdiction:	Υ	N	N/A	CRS Class
1. Park County, MT (mapped 1/1/87)	X			10
2. City of Livingston (mapped 5/19/87)	X			10
3. Town of Clyde Park			X	

^{*} Notes: Y = Participating N = Not Participating N/A = Not Mapped

XXX

February 6, 2006

Plan Approved

Date Approved

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

Jurisdiction: PARK COUNTY, MONTANA

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

- N Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.
- **S Satisfactory:** The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)	NOT MET	MET
Adoption by the Local Governing Body: §201.6(c)(5) OR		N/A
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)		s
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		S
Planning Process	N	s
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)		S
Risk Assessment	N	s
Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		s
Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		s
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)		s
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)	N	
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)		s
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)		S
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii)		S

Mitigation Strategy	N	S
Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)		S
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii)		s
Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)		S
Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)		S
Plan Maintenance Process	N	s
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(i)		s
Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)		S
Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)		S

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

See Reviewer's Comments

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

the furtsuiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., e	ity Council, County	Commissioner, Trion Council).		
	Location in the		SCO	ORE
	Plan (section or		NOT	
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?		N/A		
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?		N/A		
		SUMMARY SCORE		N/A

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must document that it has been formally adopted.

	Location in the		SCC	ORE
	Plan (section or		NOT	
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	MET	MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	Page 2-1	The plan was developed for Park County and unincorporated jurisdictions, the City of Livingston, and the Town of Clyde Park.		Х
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?	Section 1	All jurisdictions adopted the plan.		Х
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	Section 1	A copy of each resolution is included in the plan.		Х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

in the process Statewide plans will not be accepted	и из <i>нини-</i> јинзиненони	i piuns.		
	Location in the		SCO	ORE
	Plan (section or		NOT	
Element	annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	MET	MET
A. Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	Page 3-1	The plan describes an extensive methodology for participation. The developers went out of their way to be inclusive.		Х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.6(b): An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include: (1) An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;

- (2) An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and
- (3) Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.

Requirement \\$201.6(c)(1): [The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.

		Location in the		SCC	ORE
Ele	ement	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A.	Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	Page 3-1	They have a well documented process.		Х
B.	Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	Page 3-1 Appendix B	Many different people from various agencies, local, state, and federal were involved, and also included businesses and the general public. Attendance records are in Appendix B. Recommended Action: For future submittal, include more specific information on who was involved and their role. The role of the external contributors, including Big Sky Hazard Management, is not defined.		х
C.	Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Page 3-1 Appendices A	The public was invited to participate through notices in the paper, which were placed in Appendix A.		Х
D.	Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Page 3-1	While not specifically addressed, the area newspaper did have several public notices used to announce meetings. The process provided an opportunity for a wide range of interested parties to be involved in the process. Recommendation: For the five year update, it is recommended that certain specific neighboring communities, agencies, academia, etc. be invited to participate in the process. They may have particular insights and knowledge that could be useful to the planning process.		Х

E.	Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Page4-1 to 4-3 Table 4.1	The plan identifies many different information sources, used in the gathering of hazard information. Recommended Action, for future a submittal: include a section that summarizes the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports and technical information. Most of the information is included in the plan, but it is hard to find.	×
			SUMMARY SCORE	Х

RISK ASSESSMENT: $\S 201.6(c)(2)$: The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.

	Location in the			SCC	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments		N	S
A. Does the plan include a description of the types of all natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction?	Pages 4-1 to 4-3	The plan identifies 18 hazards for profiling.			
If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score. Consult with the State Hazard Mitigation Officer to identify applicable hazards that may occur in the planning area.					Х
			SUMMARY SCORE		Х

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan **shall** include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.

	Location in the		SCO	DRE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 4-27 thru 4-127	Locations for each hazard are identified where data is available. Where known, the impacts to each jurisdiction are identified. Count-wide data is also presented. Excellent use of maps to convey information. Other references available include:		Х

B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 4-27 thru 4-127	www.sheldus.org provides historical data and information on past property damage dollar amounts at the county level, and provides a methodology to rank counties based on past disaster damage. The plan does a good job of giving a historical perspective of each hazard, showing the impacts and severity of each. There were data limitations that were also identified. Recommended Action: For future submittal, consider redrafting Maps 4.66-4.68. The Crown Fire Potential symbols are faint and barely readable. In the mapping, other features such as slope, crown density, etc. may better represent severity in the WUI.	X
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 4-27 thru 4-127	Good research on the historical side of the review.	Х
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 4-27 thru 4-127	Probability of future events was provided for each hazard.	Х
		SUMMARY SCORE	Х

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Location in the SCORE Plan (section or N S Element **Reviewer's Comments** annex and page #) A. Does the plan include an **overall summary** description Each jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards is documented. Pages 4-27 thru Χ of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard? 4-127 B. Does the plan address the **impact** of each hazard on Pages 4-27 thru The impact of each hazard is described in the plan. Χ the jurisdiction? 4-127 Χ SUMMARY SCORE

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area \dots .

and critical factures to caled in the identified hazard are	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Pages 4-27 thru 4-127	Using maps and charts, buildings and critical infrastructure is well presented relative to the various hazards. Critical infrastructure is identified for each hazard. Where the hazard has a spatial component, i.e. flood, maps are used to identify the existing critical infrastructure. The type and number of existing buildings are also included. Work is included under Mitigation goals on bridges. More work could be done on bringing in infrastructure. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.		х
B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Pages 4-21 -25 & Pages 4-27 thru 4-127	Although future development is addressed for each hazard, it is general. There is minimal information on the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities required as a part of future development. Recommended Action: Include a map showing the area of anticipated growth, with estimates of numbers and types of buildings. Also, consider expanding your present analysis to include the specifics described under Land Use and Future Development on page 4-21. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.	Х	
	•	SUMMARY SCORE	Х	

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate

	Location in the		SCC)RE
	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
vulnerable structures?	Pages 4-17 – 4 - 25 Pages 4-27 thru 4- 127	Potential dollar losses are generally provided. Recommendation: Complete missing potential dollar loss computations for on critical facilities and structures listed on pages 4-4 thru 4-10 Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.		Х
	Pages 4-25 and 4- 26	The county appears to be taking aggressive action in developing a detailed database of structures in the county. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.		Х
		SUMMARY SCORE		X

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?	Pages 4-21 thru 4- 25	The plan shows well thought out concepts for growth and development throughout the county. The City-County Zoning Resolution and the Park County Subdivision Regulations provide for mitigation activities to reduce property loss. Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.		х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	Pages 4-27 thru 4- 127	Where applicable, the risks for each participating jurisdiction are included. Recommended Action: For future submittal, consider including a table to summarize risks to each jurisdiction. The table can be used to demonstrate what risks are equal for each jurisdiction and which hazards/risks are unique or varied for each jurisdiction.		x
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

MITIGATION STRATEGY: \$201.6(c)(3): The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy **shall** include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (GOALS are long-term; represent what the community wants to achieve, such as "eliminate flood damage"; and are based on the risk assessment findings.)	Pages 5-1 to 5-3	The plan contains a broad range of goals, six in all, that illuminate the mitigation strategy for the county.		X
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy **shall** include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	Pages 5-1 to 5-7	A comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects are included for each hazard.		Х
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure?	Pages 5-1 to 5-7	The plan identifies a variety of means to reduce the impacts of hazards to new buildings. These include: building new schools outside the floodplain; restrict or prohibit development in the floodplain; require defensible space and inspections for new development in the wildland urban interface; and earthquake measures. Recommended Action: For future submittal, consider expanding the existing work to include known or possible future development and identify actions to reduce effects of hazards in those areas.		X
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure?	Pages 5-1 to 5-7	The actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure. The actions do not specifically address all High Risk hazards identified in the plan. Goal 6—Promote all-hazard mitigation measures—does help to cover effects of the Moderate to Low Risk hazards. Recommended Action: For future submittal, consider expanding the existing work to identify specific actions for the Moderate to Low risk hazards.		х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: $\S 201.6(c)(3)(iii)$: [The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.

	Location in the		SC	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized ? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	Pages 5-8 to 5- 12	The plan discusses how the actions were prioritized.		X
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered ? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	Pages 5-8 to 5- 12	Marginally met. Table 5.2 outlines Jurisdiction, Responsible Department/Partner and potential funding source for each of the actions. Recommendation: The scoring range is very small. We suggest that the scoring mechanism be adjusted to spread the scores out to give a better picture of the true ranking. Also, for the five year update, the county needs to better identify the timeframes for doing the projects.		Х
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review (see page 3-36 of <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i>) to maximize benefits?	Pages 5-5 to 5-7	Table 5.1 describes the methodology and factors used to determine cost effectiveness of the measures.		Х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Χ

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

	Location in the		SCC	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	Pages 5-8 thru 5- 11	The plan identifies multiple action items for Park County, the City of Livingston, and the Town of Clyde Park.		Х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)	Page 6-1	The Park County LEPC maintains the plan. Table 6.1 delineates the review activities and the document explains who does what work.		Х
B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)	Page 6-1	The plan will be evaluated every year, after a disaster, and then revised every five years.		Х
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan within the five-year cycle?	Page 6-1	Table 6.1 is an effective summary of the scheduling for revising the plan based on Post Disaster, Annual and 5 year schedule. Recommended Action: For future submittal, consider revisiting Buildings, Infrastructure and Critical Facilities on a less-than-Five Year schedule, depending on the rate of growth experienced in the County.		х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan **shall** include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.

	Location in the		SCO	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	Page 5-12	Park County is developing a Growth Plan, which should be incorporated into a future revision of this plan and also borrow from this plan. The LEPC, Park County Planning Officials, and the Livingston Planning Department have committed to focus on implementing mitigation planning through building codes, subdivision regulations, land use permits, capital improvement plans and zoning regulations.		×
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	Page 5-12	This plan will be used in the development of the Growth Plan and other planning documents for Park County.		Х
		SUMMARY SCORE		Х

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

	Location in the		SC	ORE
Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	N	S
A. Does the plan explain how continued public participation will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	Page 6-2	The document provides a general look at public involvement in the planning process. Recommendation: For the five year update, expand this section and be more specific on how the county will encourage public participation.		х
		SUMMARY SCORE		X

Matrix A: Profiling Hazards

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each natural hazard that can affect the jurisdiction. **Completing the matrix is not required**.

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each **applicable** hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	A. Lo	cation	В. Е	xtent	C. Pre Occur	evious rences	D. Probability of Future Events	
	Yes	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S
Avalanche									
Coastal Erosion									
Coastal Storm									
Dam Failure			\Box						
Drought									
Earthquake									
Expansive Soils									
Extreme Heat			\Box						
Flood									
Hailstorm									
Hurricane									
Land Subsidence									
Landslide									
Severe Winter Storm			\Box						
Tornado									
Tsunami									
Volcano									
Wildfire		一百	Π				一		一百二
Windstorm		Ħ	Ħ						
Other		Π							
Other		Π							
Other									



Legend:

§201.6(c)(2)(i) Profiling Hazards

- A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each hazard addressed in the plan?
- B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?
- C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?
- D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?

To check boxes, double

click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Jurisdiction: PARK COUNTY, MONTANA

Matrix B: Assessing Vulnerability

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each requirement. Completing the matrix is not required.

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each applicable hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Note: Receiving an N in the shaded columns will not preclude the plan from passing.

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)		Sun Descr Vulne	Overall nmary iption of erability	lmį	azard pact	Structures	Exis Struct Hazar (Esti	per of sting ures in d Area mate)	B. Type Numb Futu Structu Hazard (Estin	er of ure ires in I Area nate)	Estimating Potential Losses		Estimate	B. Meth	
	Yes	_	N	S	N	<u>s</u>	달	N	<u>s</u>	N	<u>s</u>	<u>ia</u>	N	S	<u>N</u>	<u> </u>
Avalanche		iev					첉					ent				
Coastal Erosion		erv										o to				
Coastal Storm		Overview					Ş					g F				
Dam Failure		.;					풀					ij				
Drought		oilií					Identifying					ini				
Earthquake		ırak										Est				
Expansive Soils		Vulnerability:					l ≝									
Extreme Heat							rab					ij.				
Flood		Assessing					Vulnerability:					Vulnerability:				
Hailstorm		SSE					7					lue				
Hurricane		SS					ng					Ν				
Land Subsidence							Assessing					Assessing				
Landslide		2)(i					sse					ssi				
Severe Winter Storm		c)(;										sse				
Tornado		§201.6(c)(2)(ii)					.6(c)(2)(ii)					Ä				
Tsunami		20					3					.6(c)(2)(ii)				
Volcano		S					9.)(z				
Wildfire							\$201					9)9.				
Windstorm							iò					§201.				
Other												Š				
Other																
Other																

§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

- A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?
- B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A) Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings,

B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B) Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

- A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?
- B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?

infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

Matrix C: Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure consideration of a range of actions for each hazard. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each **applicable** hazard. An "N" for any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

	Hazards Identified	A. Comprehensive					
Hazard Type	Per Requirement	Range of Actions					
1142414 1960	§201.6(c)(2)(i)	and Projects					
	Yes	N S					
Avalanche							
Coastal Erosion							
Coastal Storm							
Dam Failure							
Drought							
Earthquake							
Expansive Soils							
Extreme Heat							
Flood							
Hailstorm							
Hurricane							
Land Subsidence							
Landslide							
Severe Winter Storm							
Tornado							
Tsunami							
Volcano							
Wildfire	\Box						
Windstorm							
Other							
Other							
Other							



Legend

§201.6(c)(3)(ii) Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?